

Project: Harrington and Embro Dam EAs **Meeting No.:** PIC 3
Project No.: 1505 **Meeting Date:** October 17, 2016
Recorder: M. Pushkar **Meeting Time:** 7 – 9 pm
Report date: October 18, 2016

Location: Embro Community Centre – 355644 35th Line, Embro, ON

Attendees: Rick Goldt, Bill Mackie, (UTRCA)
Wolfgang Wolter, Mariëtte Pushkar (ERI)
Marie Keasey, Doug Matheson, Marcus Ryan (Zorra Township)
Members of the public (8)

Purpose: Public Information Centre 3 – Embro Dam

Item	Description	Action By
1.	<p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of study process, evaluation criteria, evaluation process, preferred alternative, impacts and mitigation made by Wolfgang Wolter and Mariëtte Pushkar (ERI) 	Info
2.	<p>Questions posed by members of the public and answers provided by team:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <p>For Alternatives 2 and 3, why did you not look at the IDF? At the EA stage, actual design flow values are not necessary to enable an evaluation of the alternatives. During detailed design stage, however, the flows that need to be accommodated for dam function, or for the creek design, will need to be determined; this will require further analysis.</p> <p>How will sediment load affect the downstream watercourse, will there be a delta? Under the preferred alternative, sediment is expected to be conveyed downstream. Currently, the creek downstream of the dam is sediment starved. There may be some increase in sediment deposition, but this is not expected to be excessive and to result in delta formation. Sediment will be deposited onto the floodplain during periods of high flow.</p> <p>Was sediment considered in the cost evaluation? Yes, sediment removal was considered in the cost evaluation. The cost for operation and maintenance includes sediment removal costs pro-rated on an annual basis; actual sediment removal work would occur on a zero to ten year frequency.</p> <p>On what data sources was the sediment accumulation rate based? Did it consider sediment removals completed in the 1980s Bathymetric surveys of the pond were compared, as outlined presented at PIC 2. Yes, the sediment volumes did consider sediment removals. The rate of sedimentation within the pond changes through time in response to landuse practices. The estimated volume is appropriate for planning purposes.</p> 	

	<p>5. How does the overall rank include cost, doesn't cost drive everything? Cost is specifically included as one criteria within the economic evaluation category. Cost does not determine the evaluation result since it is only one component of the evaluation process.</p> <p>6. Did you know that there is potential Federal Funding available? It is the Recreational Fisheries Conservation Partnerships Program Thank you, this will be noted in the report.</p> <p>7. Please describe the iteration process of the evaluation table The evaluation table was first developed by ERI. The table was reviewed and updated through review by several UTRCA staff. Additional input to the table and rankings was obtained through a Technical Steering Committee meeting in which UTRCA staff and Township staff participated.</p> <p>8. Brook Trout and the potential for habitat creation should be considered in the evaluation Brook Trout are considered in the aquatic (river) criteria, under the Natural Environment category.</p>	
--	---	--
